REMARKS

In response to the 35 USC 112 rejection set out in Sections 2 and 3 of the final Office Action issued September 6, 2006 in connection with the above application, claim 19 has been amended to refer to "at least one second electrode" a term for which there is clear antecedent in claim 18. No new matter is introduced by this amendment. The undersigned attorney thanks the Examiner for drawing this error in claim 19 to his attention.

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application and all claims are rejected. Firstly, claims 1-4, 6, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18 and 20 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Greanias et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,386,219, in view of Blanchard, U.S. Patent No. 4,893,115. This rejection is traversed. More specifically, this rejection is traversed on the grounds that the rejection assumes a particular mode of construction of the structures shown in Figures 5-8 of Greanias, and that all the available evidence suggests that this structure is not in fact constructed by the assumed method.

Claim 1 requires that the surface of the adhesive layer remote from the display medium form an external surface of the display, so that the display can be attached to a receiving surface by the adhesive layer. Manifestly, this is not the case in the structures shown in Figures 5-8 of Greanias (hereinafter for convenience the "Greanias structures), where the adhesive layer 99 is buried deep within the multilayer structure and is incapable of being used to attach the display surface 18 to anything. Accordingly, the undersigned attorney presumes that the Examiner is suggesting the Greanias structures are produced by first providing a display in accordance with present claim 1, with an exposed adhesive layer on one external surface, and thereafter that this display/adhesive layer sub-assembly is attached via the adhesive layer to the remaining layers 90-98 (in Figure 5) of the finger touch and stylus detection system. However, all the evidence in Greanias is that this is not how the Greanias structures are formed; instead, Greanias teaches that the adhesive layer 99 is provided on the lower substrate 90 so that the

adhesive layer 99 can be used to attach the entire finger touch and stylus detection system as a single unit to the display 18.

Firstly, claims 6, 12 and 21 of Greanias are explicitly directed to overlays (i.e., finger touch and stylus detection systems) comprising an adhesive layer to attach the overlay to the viewing surface of the display. There is no description anywhere in Greanias which suggests applying the adhesive to the display. Instead as an alternative to attaching the overlay to the glass LCD surface 18 by means of the adhesive 99 (as mentioned at column 18, lines 56-57), Greanias teaches the overlay may be attached to another piece of glass or other transparent material by an adhesive and then mounted to the LCD 18 (column 18, lines 57-61).

Secondly, Greanias consistently states that his finger touch and stylus detection system is a transparent overlay placed over the display screen (of a computer) - see, for example, column 1, lines 44-45 and column 3, lines 25-29. Clearly, such an overlay is intended to be an optional accessory for a computer which is already complete, and not all computers of a given type will require the use of such an overlay. The logical way for the manufacturer to provide such an overlay is as a single unit which can either be secured to the computer screen by an adhesive layer incorporated into the overlay (such an adhesive layer could of course be covered by a release layer to prevent contamination prior to use) or which is mounted on a transparent glass or similar plate which can be mounted immediately adjacent the computer screen, exactly in accordance with the portions of Greanias noted in the preceding paragraph. To require a person wishing to fit such an overlay to a computer screen to first apply a separate layer of adhesive to the computer screen (with the obvious difficulties of providing a flat, uniform adhesive layer) and then to secure the other layers of the overlay to the adhesive-coated screen, as the Examiner apparently suggests, is hardly a consumer-friendly or even practicable approach.

Claims 10 and 20 are patentable over Greanias and Blanchard for the same reasons as claim 1. As already noted, Greanias does not form an adhesive layer over an

optoelectrically active display medium and then attach the display medium to a receiving surface by means of this adhesive layer, but rather provides an adhesive layer as part of an overlay which is then attached to an optoelectrically active display medium by means of the adhesive layer.

The 35 USC 103(a) rejections set out in Sections 6-8 of the Office Action are traversed for the same reasons as the earlier 35 USC 103(a) rejection of claims 1 and 10, as discussed above.

Claims 1, 16, 17, 10, 18, 19 and 20 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Matsubara et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,065,505, in view of Iwashita et al., U.S. Patent No. 4,715,686. This rejection is traversed. More specifically, this rejection is traversed on the grounds that Matsubara does not describe an adhesive layer disposed on the second surface of the display medium, as required by all the present claims.

Present claim defines an electrically active display comprising, *inter alia,* an optoelectrically active display medium having first and second surfaces on opposed sides thereof, and an adhesive layer disposed on the second surface of the display medium. On its face, this wording requires that the adhesive layer *overlap at least part of the display medium* so that the display medium can be attached to a receiving surface by the adhesive layer.

In Matsubara there is no such overlap of the adhesive layer and the display medium. Figure 2 of Matsubara and the related description at column 3, lines 3-6 show a display in which narrow edge portions of the glass board 4 of a liquid crystal display are connected with circuit boards 3 (which contain driver circuitry for the display 4 - see column 3, lines 6-9) via light-transmissive flexible boards 2. The flexible boards 2 have "shaded" electrodes 6 which are connected to second electrodes 7 on the glass board 4.

The invention described and claimed in Matsubara is a process for connecting two sets of electrodes on different circuit boards, such as the electrodes 6 and 7 on boards 2 and 4 respectively in Figure 3. The Matsubara process comprises (see column 2, lines 4-29 and claim 1): (a) applying a photocuring adhesive on the first

electrodes (which are opaque - column 2, line 28) and adjacent regions of the first board (which is light transmissive - column 2, line 29); (b) irradiating light through the first circuit board to cure the photocuring adhesive except where the light is blocked by the opaque first electrodes; (c) adhering conductive particles to the uncured photocuring adhesive overlying the first electrodes; and (d) superposing the first circuit board with the conductive particles thereon over the second circuit board to electrically connect the first and second electrodes with each other through the conductive particles.

The foregoing summary of the Matsubara process should render it apparent that the areas in which the boards 2 overlap the glass board 4 in Matsubara's display cannot be areas in which the liquid crystal display medium is present since the presence of opaque electrodes 6 in such areas would necessarily introduce permanently dark areas on the display, which would be completely unacceptable. Hence, in the Matsubara process, the adhesive layer is not disposed on the second surface of the display medium, as required by the all the relevant claims.

For the foregoing reasons, the 35 USC 103(a) rejections in the Office Action are unsound and should be withdrawn.

Since the normal period for responding to the Office Action expired December 6, 2006, a Petition for a two month extension of this period is filed herewith. The fees for this Petition and the Request for Continued Examination are being paid with this electronic filing.

Respectfully submitted
/David J. Cole/
David J. Cole
Registration No. 29629

E INK Corporation
733 Concord Avenue
Cambridge MA 02138

Telephone (617) 499-6069
Fax (617) 499-6200
E-mail dcole@eink.com